

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes that claims 1 and 2 have been amended in order to address the antecedent basis issue regarding the radial portion. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this claim are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-13, and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Victor (U.S. Pat. No. 2172325). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Riesing (U.S. Pat. No. 2804325). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that each of the independent claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended to define the entire liner as being movable with the lip portion about the hinge portion toward and away from the case. Applicant respectfully submits that in the device of Victor et al, the entire liner is not movable about the hinge portion

with the elastomeric lip portion toward and away from the case, as claimed. Instead, there is a portion of the liner that is always disposed against the case since the liner extends beyond the hinge portion of the lip. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended properly distinguish from Victor et al '325.

With regard to Riesing '325, it is noted that a portion 50 of the liner 48 is always disposed against the case 46. Therefore, the entire liner is not movable about the hinge portion with the elastomeric lip portion toward and away from the case, as claimed. Therefore, Applicant submits that the claims as amended distinguish from the disclosure of Riesing '325.

In view of the above comments and the amendments to the independent claims, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-20 as amended.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (734) 354-5445.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 28, 2004

By: Ronald W. Wangerow
Ronald W. Wangerow, Reg. No. 29,597

FREUDENBERG-NOK GENERAL PARTNERSHIP
Intellectual Property Department
47690 East Anchor Court
Plymouth, MI 48170-2455
Direct Line: (734) 354-5445
Facsimile: (734) 451-2547